



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/089,903	04/03/2002	Franck Abelard	PF990066	6844

7590 09/05/2008  
Joseph S Tripoli  
Thomson Multimedia Licensing  
Patent Operations  
CN 5312  
Princeton, NJ 08543-0028

EXAMINER
----------

DANG, HUNG Q

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2621

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

09/05/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 08/01/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

At page 7, Applicant argues that Sato is non-analogous art and is not in the same field of endeavor as the claimed subject matter since Sato is not concerned with writing data, such as compressed video, audio and auxiliary data, to a recording medium and in particular, with managing the write buffers of a device. In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees because Sato addresses the problem of is buffer management, which is a specific problem that needs to be solved in Naimpally and Yoneda as well as the claimed subject matter. Therefore, Sato's disclosure of buffer management is analogous art. One of ordinary skill in the art have good reasons to look into Sato's teachings regarding buffer management because Sato approach would reduce the amount of memory used for this purpose (Sato, column 5, lines 34-36). Since saving memory used in a digital design is desirable, the combination of Sato with the teachings of Naimpally and Yoneda is obvious in contrast with Applicant arguments that "the combination of Sato with the teachings of Naimpally and Yoneda is non-obvious" and that there is lack of motivation to combine Sato with Naimpally and Yoneda as asserted by Applicant at pages 7-8.

Also, because the motivation of combining Sato with Naimpally and Yoneda is clear and desirable as described above, there is no impermissible hindsight used in combining the references.

Art Unit: 2621

For ongoing reasons, the claims are rejected as previously presented.

/Hung Q Dang/

Examiner, Art Unit 2621

/Thai Tran/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2621